UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X Docket#

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 17-cr-00281(ERK)

- versus -: U.S. Courthouse

: Brooklyn, New York

CARLOS MARTINEZ,

: April 13, 2022 Defendant : 3:19 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. KORMAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:

For the Government: Breon S. Peace, Esq. United States Attorney

> BY: Nadia Shihata, Esq. Elizabeth Geddes, Esq. Assistant U.S. Attorneys 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

For the Defendant: Anthony L. Ricco, Esq. Steven Z. Legon, Esq.

20 Vesey Street, Suite 400

New York, NY 10007

Carlos M. Santiago, Esq.

The Law Office of Carlos M. Santiago 11 Broadway, Suite 615 New York, NY 10004

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc. Transcription Service:

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795 RL.Transcriptions2@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

```
2
                            Proceedings
              THE CLERK: We're on for Criminal Cause for
1
 2
   Sentencing in 17-cr-281, The United States v. Carlos
 3
   Martinez.
              Counsel, please state your appearances for the
 4
 5
   record.
 6
              MS. SHIHATA: Good afternoon, your Honor.
7
   Nadia Shihata and Elizabeth Geddes for the United States.
 8
              MR. RICCO: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 9
   Anthony Ricco, Carlos Santiago, Steven Legon for Carlos
10
   Martinez.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm not sure whether
12
   I'm going to sentence him or not, but you can call it
13
   sentencing. I just want to go through some of the legal
14
   issues that have been raised so that we can get them
15
   ironed out including God knows when I was getting emails
16
   last night with submissions.
17
              So how shall we organize this? I guess there
18
   are pending motions. You moved for judgment of acquittal
19
   and you've made other arguments. Why don't you take the
20
   lead? I mean you want to take the lead?
21
              MS. SHIHATA: I'm just happy to answer your
22
   questions and Mr. Ricco can of course correct me if I get
23
   it wrong. I don't believe any post trial motions on the
   second trial were in fact filed so --
24
25
              THE COURT: I thought he was asking for the
```

```
3
                            Proceedings
   paper that he filed not last night --
1
 2
              MS. SHIHATA: I think he alluded to the fact
 3
   that maybe down the line he may choose to file something
   but at this point my understanding is we're prepared to
 4
   proceed to sentencing and of course Mr. Ricco can --
 5
 6
              THE COURT: Maybe I didn't read it right. Do I
7
   have this?
 8
              MS. SHIHATA: I have copies of everything.
 9
              THE COURT: I should have copies too. Do I
10
   have his sentencing order?
11
                       (Pause in proceedings)
12
              THE COURT: Or didn't mislay this document
13
   which I'm talking the lawyer just sent me in April.
14
   Where's the one before April 12th? Is April 12th your
15
   last and only filing in relation to this?
16
              MR. RICCO: Substantive, yes, Judge.
17
              MS. SHIHATA: There's one earlier one, Judge.
18
   I think it's dated -- filed on I think it was October 1st
19
   or September 30, 2021. It's ECF docket number 129.
20
              MR. RICCO: Yes. That's the defendant's
21
   sentencing recommendation. That's 129. ECF document 130
22
   is objections to the PSR. The next substantive filing
23
   would have been the filing on the evening of the 12th.
24
              THE COURT: Well that was yesterday.
25
              MS. SHIHATA: Yes, your Honor.
```

```
4
                            Proceedings
              MR. RICCO:
1
                          Yes.
 2
              THE COURT: But I thought I read something
 3
   before yesterday. In fact, you responded to it and you
   even threw in a line that said he had only until -- I
 4
   mean that --
 5
 6
              MS. SHIHATA: I'm sorry.
 7
              THE COURT: You said it's too late because he
 8
   didn't file it by April 20th.
 9
              MS. SHIHATA: Well also, he didn't file it.
10
   There's a footnote or a sentence in the sentencing
11
   recommendation that says something about that and the --
12
              THE COURT: Right. And I need to see it. I
13
   mean I thought you said it was too late and I thought he
14
   said something to indicate that it wouldn't have been too
15
   late. April 20, 2020 this court was for all practical
16
   purposes in shutdown and it wasn't on for sentencing. I
17
   don't want to get involved if he hasn't moved. But my
18
   normal practice is invariably when a jury reaches a
19
   guilty verdict, I give the defendant until the date of
20
   sentencing to file any motions that have to be filed
21
   within seven days of the verdict. It's almost automatic.
22
   But if he didn't move, he didn't move. I thought I saw
23
   it.
24
              Okay. So you haven't moved. So what do you
25
   want from me?
```

5 Proceedings MR. RICCO: Judge, we're prepared to go 1 2 The issues that we would have raised in the 3 motion have been preserved. We had a sidebar about it. Your Honor decided it was a legal issue and related to 4 5 the concept of whether or not a threat of force had to be 6 related to an exercise of force, not just a threat of 7 force. 8 THE COURT: Look, the government has 9 unnecessarily complicated this case as they usually do. 10 There were five separate incidents involving sexual 11 contact and for each one they use four separate statutes. 12 And that sort of complicates it. The one count, as I 13 view the verdict, the verdict was complicated by the fact 14 that there were two trials and probation used one 15 numbering and I think I had another one. Do you have the 16 verdict sheet? I'm just going to pull up the verdict 17 sheet that I gave to the jury because it's much easier 18 for me to deal with. 19 MS. SHIHATA: To the extent it's helpful, 20 Judge, in the government's October 28 --21 THE COURT: It's not helpful the way you set it 22 You gave me one set and then something on the 23 bottom of it. 24 MS. SHIHATA: Just it shows the counts in both 25 the redacted indictment and the original.

```
6
                            Proceedings
              THE COURT: Yes, I know but I don't want it.
1
              MS. SHIHATA: Okay. It's not helpful. That's
 2
 3
   fine.
              THE COURT: Just when I charged the jury I used
 4
   the verdict sheet that I gave them. And when I went back
 5
 6
   to see what I charged the jury, it was useful for me to
 7
   be able to use the verdict sheet I gave them. Are you
 8
   going to be able to find it? I got it. Okay.
 9
              At the first trial the jury I believe convicted
10
   the defendant of everything. I set aside the verdict I
   guess on all of the counts except what I would call the
11
12
   count involving the --
13
              MR. RICCO: Ward?
14
              MS. SHIHATA: Sexual abuse of a ward, your
15
   Honor?
              THE COURT: The ward, yes. The sexual abuse of
16
17
   the ward which was not an issue and was not affected by
18
   the Brady material.
19
              Of the counts that were submitted to the jury,
20
   the deprivation of rights, which also coincides with the
21
   aggravated special sexual abuse as it must because I
22
   charged the jury that in order to find deprivation of
23
   rights they ultimately have to find as one element
24
   aggravated sexual abuse. And so the verdict sheet is
25
   consistent in that they found the defendant guilty on
```

Proceedings

count 4 which is deprivation of rights, count 5 which is the aggravated special abuse which coincides with date. And then they also found him guilty of sexual abuse on one of the counts that did not involve penetration. I'm sorry, on one of the counts I think the second December 13, 2015 count only because they wanted to be consistent all the way through.

element, the same critical element. And I don't see how I can set aside the jury verdict. I don't say this is not a troubling case which is why having tried the case in 2019 I spent three of the last four days reading the transcript. And there are aspects of the case that are troubling including the telephone call that she had, what a telephone call -- the investigation, what I'll call the Facebook investigation which leaves serious questions as to its purpose in my own mind. It seems to me that this is a jury question. I can't set the verdict aside under the normal standards of government that govern the jury, jury verdicts notwithstanding that I find they are troubling aspects in this case.

So now the other counts don't matter to the calculation of the guidelines. They might matter if they added anything to any of the guidelines in life where a sentence within the guidelines would be relevant if the

8

jury had found him quilty of five counts of forcible 1 2 rape, which they didn't. And I regarded the verdicts on 3 counts 3 to 15 as really -- it seems to me it doesn't apply to what was charged. I don't believe -- I believe 4 that as charged and as she testified, the victim, she did 5 not consent because she was threatened or because of 6 7 fear. Possibly she may not have recorded it for that 8 reason. But she didn't testify, and you can find it for 9 me if you can, where she testified that the reason for 10 her consent was fear or force. In fact, if you take a 11 look at your own letter which describes in some detail 12 her testimony, let me see if I have that, it was all 13 force. He just used force each time in order to have 14 sexual relations with her. It wasn't caused by anything 15 other than his physical strength and his ability to rape 16 her.

MS. SHIHATA: May I respond, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. What I'm saying is it may not affect the guidelines but I don't think it adds -- that is the guidelines would still be life when I say that.

And I'm not even sure that it affects what sentence within the guideline range because it's all the same basic conduct. But go ahead. Take a look at page 4 of your letter.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SHIHATA: Sorry, which of the letters?

9 Proceedings THE COURT: I think it's your letter of October 1 2 28, 2021. 3 MR. RICCO: Okay. So your Honor --THE COURT: These are all forcible rapes as you 4 5 described them. In your opening statement you refer to them that way. Ms. Geddes was a little bit more subtle 6 7 and tried to work in fear and threats. But to the extent -- I don't recall that she testified that that was 8 9 the reason how she came to engage in that. And I think 10 the statute, the only way the statute could be sensibly read is it's a kind of forced consent, not by physical 11 12 force, but by threat of force. 13 In this case, if you read what you wrote, if 14 you read what you argued to the jury and what she 15 testified to, which is what you quote, on page 4 of your 16 letter you quote all the evidence, this was simply a 17 case, if you believe the testimony, where he physically 18 raped her. That's sort of the way I view those counts. 19 I don't know whether anybody thinks when they 20 draft an indictment about how the case is going to be 21 presented and what problems it's going to entail 22 particularly with a witness like this one. But that's 23 sort of my view of it. 24 So you know, for the purpose of sentencing, I'm 25 looking at this as a one count indictment, one count

```
10
                            Proceedings
1
   conviction, however I have to record it on whatever sheet
 2
   that the Sentencing Commission makes me file as their
 3
   bookkeeper.
              MS. SHIHATA: So I'll be brief, your Honor, and
 4
 5
   mostly state this for the record. But first of all, we
 6
   agree that the guidelines are driven by the convictions
 7
   regarding the deprivation of civil rights and the
 8
   aggravated sexual abuse that predicates it.
 9
              THE COURT: It's the same thing.
10
              MS. SHIHATA: Correct.
              THE COURT: It's the same thing.
11
12
              MS. SHIHATA: I understand, Judge. I'm not
13
   disagreeing with you. Where I do disagree is that it is
14
   mutually exclusive that the assault, the sexual abuse in
15
   this case could not be both through physical force, and
16
   you're right, we lay out and we believe we do assert that
17
   physical force was used for all of them.
18
              THE COURT: That's her testimony.
19
   testimony was -- the reason that I agreed to do it was it
20
   was because I was afraid, he threatened to do something
21
   to me if I didn't agree to, if I didn't acquiesce.
22
              MS. SHIHATA: I understand, Judge.
23
              THE COURT: And in fact I put down here -- but
24
   go ahead, I don't want to delay you.
25
              MS. SHIHATA: Judge, I fully understand that
```

Proceedings

you disagree with me. That's of course fine, your prerogative. But my point is simply that the case law does not require just an explicit threat in order for the sexual abuse counts to be well founded.

THE COURT: They may not. I'm not saying that it does. I'm talking about what you charged him with and what you proved and what her testimony was. The fact that he has the ability to cause her harm, that to me is almost the same thing as a ward, in the capacity of a ward, in his capacity as a ward, he had the power to do as (indiscernible).

I mean basically what you've done here is totally confuse this case with the way you've charged.

MS. SHIHATA: Judge, I understand that's your perspective. Respectively, the government disagrees. Respectfully, Judge, there was evidence in the record from which the jury could find the sexual abuse count. I understand if your Honor disagrees.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Maybe I missed it. Could you show me where she said that the reason that I acquiesced, or she didn't acquiesce so she wouldn't have even said that, but the reason that I had sexual relations with him was because he threatened --

MS. SHIHATA: That's not the legal requirement, Judge. It does not need to be that he said the words if

1 | you don't have sex with me I will put you in the SHU.

2 That is not what the case law requires and I'm not

suggesting that the evidence showed that explicitly.

THE COURT: No your case law that you cited to me was the threat or the fear, it doesn't have to be.

Obviously, you know, in the way the statutes are written if it's too much of a physical threat, it doesn't even violate the statute that you've charged. But the statute still requires that it caused the act to take place.

MS. SHIHATA: And an act can be caused to take place by multiple things. Was there physical force? We believe there was. But there was also --

THE COURT: There was, of course. I don't want to say of course. The jury found, I accept the jury's verdict. There are aspects of her testimony and the evidence in this case that are problematic. But in terms of the jury's verdict, I'm not arguing with it.

MS. SHIHATA: I understand, Judge, and I won't belabor the point. I understand what you're saying.

THE COURT: Good. Mark, did I give you something? There's actually an amendment to the statute that's not directly relevant that was March 22nd. But I believe one provision that was added that sort of helps, it says "Engages in a sexual act that causes another person to engage in a sexual act." And now I'm skipping

13 Proceedings the language we've argued about. "Without that other 1 2 person's consent to include doing so through coercion." 3 So it's the causing to do the particular act through threats, fear or coercion. 4 But in any event, I found this accidentally 5 6 just by Shepardizing some of the cases that you cited in 7 your brief. And the Second Circuit case that you cite in your brief is actually a case where I think the officer 8 9 testified that that was the reason why she consented. 10 I'm talking about the one in the Federal Appendix that 11 you cited in your brief. 12 MS. SHIHATA: That was a guilty plea, your Honor, yes. 13 14 THE COURT: I'm sorry, guilty plea. Even 15 better. 16 MS. SHIHATA: I have nothing to add on this 17 point, your Honor. I will rest on our papers and --18 THE COURT: Okay. So let's deal with what's a 19 reasonable sentence here. 20 MS. SHIHATA: Are you starting with me? 21 THE COURT: Whoever wants to talk about it. 22 MS. SHIHATA: Go ahead. 23 MR. RICCO: Oh, thanks. Judge, it's always 24 difficult to pick a place to start it sentencing. I 25 would share with the Court that as the Court can see from

14 Proceedings our submissions, sentencing submissions, document 129 and 1 2 130, we struggled with the issues that your Honor just 3 discussed as to how do the verdicts in this case translate into a reasonable sentence given all of the 4 factors the 3553(a). 5 6 And so we laid those arguments out. I think 7 your Honor's had that. It's interesting, Judge, that the 8 jury in this case rejected the theory of force of the 15 9 counts that went to the jury. 10 THE COURT: Well, they rejected her testimony. 11 They essentially, on the counts that they acquitted, 12 which were forcible counts --13 MR. RICCO: And your Honor --14 THE COURT: -- went through the deprivation of 15 rights and the aggravated sexual abuse, they found that 16 she was not telling the truth. There's no other way to 17 explain that acquittal. 18 MR. RICCO: So your Honor, we looked at it from 19 the standpoint of mitigation in sentencing and how does 20 this verdict, how the underlying factors as spoken by the 21 jury apply here at sentencing. So it took a long time, 22 Judge. It took a long time, a lot of thought, a lot of 23 work. And I think we've laid that out. 24 So this is what I'd like to say, Judge. It's 25 very rare that we're here for sentencing with a defendant

```
15
                            Proceedings
   that we've spent so much time with. I mean length of
1
 2
   time. So Judge, when we started this case, Carlos
 3
   Santiago was just married, he had no kids.
              THE COURT: With a wife that he was --
 4
              MR. RICCO: With a wife.
 5
 6
              THE COURT: With a wife to whom he was married.
 7
              MR. RICCO: Married. That's correct.
                                                     That's
 8
   Carlos Santiago. Okay? So here we are for sentencing.
 9
   He's still married but he's got three kids now.
10
              THE COURT: And a grandchild.
11
              MR. RICCO: Well, not yet.
12
              THE COURT: Not yet? I thought there was a
13
   grandchild too.
14
              MR. RICCO: No, that's -- I'm talking about my
15
   co-counsel, Santiago.
16
              THE COURT: Oh, okay.
              MR. RICCO: And I mentioned that because of the
17
18
   breadth of the time period that we've had on this case.
19
   And I know that oftentimes people view defense
20
   perspective is just adversarial. They're just saying
21
   that because they're the defendant and that's what
22
   they're supposed to say. They could think that but the
23
   reality is far from that. We've had a lot of time to
   spend with Carlos Martinez. He has been in Essex County
24
25
   Jail 59 months and a few weeks. Five years. He's been
```

16 Proceedings there under very harsh conditions. He was charged with a 1 2 sexual offense which makes serving time difficult in and 3 of itself, compounded by the fact that he's a law enforcement officer made his housing situation very 4 difficult. And then I won't even get into COVID. But a 5 6 great deal of time was spent relating to Carlos Martinez 7 about what happened to him. How did this happen to you? 8 What's going on with your life? Because everything that 9 we've known about Carlos Martinez is that he signed up 10 for the Marine Corps coming out of the Red Hook projects 11 one week after his 18th birthday and he went into the 12 Marine Corps and served our country with distinction in three combat circumstances. He's decorated and came out 13 14 of the service with post stress disorder syndrome. 15 THE COURT: Well there were three theaters of 16 violent war that he was involved with. 17 MR. RICCO: Yes. 18 THE COURT: At least if I recall from your 19 submission. 20 MS. SHIHATA: Yes, Judge. 21 THE COURT: He was in Libya and Kuwait and what 22 was the third? 23 MR. RICCO: He's got Sharp Edge, which was in Africa. Just Cause, which is in Panama. And then he's 24 25 in Desert Storm, which is the Gulf War.

Proceedings

And he, as a teenager, he's distinguishing himself from the Red Hook Projects in a way that brought great pride to his grandparents that raised him for the most part, and his grandfather was in the military also.

And then he comes out of the military and goes into the Bureau of Prisons. And Judge, the government — listen, nobody is disregarding his conduct. But he goes into the Bureau of Prisons and he is respected at the highest level at the Bureau of Prisons. He's a superstar there not because he wanted to be a superstar, but because of his conduct and action. And so the officers that testified all said Carlos Martinez was held in the highest esteem at the jail. That testimony is there from the three officers. I mean it's in our submission.

But also, Judge, Ms. Otis Delacruz testified and she corroborated what the officer said. And who is Ms. Otis Delacruz? She was a lady who was in that unit with Maria on the 16th of April in particular. She had been not called as a government witness and we know why because she didn't support the theory. She testified here that he always treated her with respect and dignity as he did the other inmates. Now that's not to disregard his criminal conduct, but it's to tell us that something happened to him along the way.

And Judge, this is what you also don't know.

18

Ms. Otis Delacruz, your Honor, we brought her here under 1 2 subpoena. We caught hell for that from one of her 3 daughters. She was a very sickly lady and her daughter gave us hell for bringing her mother down. And so you 4 call the witness, you look at their sheet, you try to 5 6 figure out what's going on. And Judge, you know what we 7 discovered after the fact? That Ms. Delacruz shouldn't 8 have been in jail all that time period in the first 9 place. And so one of the things that I did was I had one 10 of my classmates in Boston look into her situation and he filed an application for compassionate release for her. 11 12 And she's released. She's with her family. She was 13 deported. She's back in the Dominican Republic. She was 14 a courier who was represented by the lawyers who 15 represented the people that she worked for. They picked 16 her lawyer and she got the time, and they went on about 17 their business which were people dealing drugs. 18 But Ms. Delacruz was like telling the truth

But Ms. Delacruz was like telling the truth about the officers she worked with and she was telling the truth about the lady that she served time with who testified here under the name of Maria.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So this guy who's respected by so many, and while he was at the Bureau of Prisons, one day he's coming to work and engaged in an act, which he received a commendation for valor, a truck was ablaze dangling off

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

19

the BQE right up the street from the jail and Carlos

Martinez runs, climbs up, carries the guy out of the

truck. I guess he saved his life. We don't know. The

guy didn't die. But he certainly removed him from peril.

And so what we know is the man before the Court for sentencing is a man who throughout his life did things to make people proud of him. His interaction with Maria is not one of those things. His criminal conduct, his criminal conduct that he was convicted of, and that criminal conduct resulted in the loss of everything that he worked for in his entire life. He was fired from his job, divorced from his wife. She waited until after the verdict. He's penniless. He lost his pension. It's all gone. Couldn't pay anybody for anything. He's got a \$20 million lawsuit pending against him brought by the person named Maria. And good luck on collecting. But the character of the defendant that's established at a time when they're not trying to curry favor but they're just doing what they think is best, you know, people don't want to hear that as sentencing. We --

THE COURT: You also left out his work at the World Trade Center.

MR. RICCO: I did, Judge. In addition to, he was a first responder at the World Trade Center and he was rewarded for that with cancer.

THE COURT: How long was he working there? It was more than just a day.

MR. RICCO: He was there many weeks. He was there three or four months, Judge.

And so he's got a lot of character. You know,
Judge, Carlos Martinez didn't testify in the first trial.

Maybe I didn't explain that to you. But he didn't
testify because he had a serious conversation with his
counsel about his oath, what the oath means, what he's
done with his life, and how he needs to go about trying
to redeem himself and get his life back on track. He
decided not to testify. And I think we made a record
about it.

Judge, there's a serious Brady violation and that serious Brady violation caused all of that work that was done in the first case to be vacated. As we said in our papers, we would have never known about it because the government effectively kept that information from us through motions in limine and protective orders and the other cases where Jane Doe number four testified. We would have never known about it, Judge, but for the fact that the defense lawyer from that case was in the courtroom previewing the testimony of the very same witnesses that would be testifying in his case. And when that testimony came in, he said that wasn't what happened

in the trial.

And so we made a Brady demand. And on the Brady demand we discovered that the government had in fact interviewed Jane Doe number four about the April 16th incident. In that interview, that individual who testified as the name Yolanda is what she testified to, provided information that was contrary to the many theories of prosecution in this case. And because of it, the Court granted the motion because it brought into question the whole concept of how force was done and what were the honest reportings of it before people got lawyered up and began thinking about the millions of dollars that they're going to get one day.

And so we had a second trial. And in the second trial, Judge, Yolanda got on the witness stand and Judge, she denied every statement that was the basis of the reasons why it was vacated. So at page 540, lines 2 to 4, she denied that Otis Delacruz asked her if she would accompany her or go with her down to clean and the woman said no. She said I never said that. She denied that a few days after this event Yolanda asked Maria why she did not want Otis Delacruz or her to go along with her to clean. She denied that that conversation ever happened. She denied that at page 540 lines 11 through 17. She denied that she told the agent and the

```
22
                            Proceedings
1
   prosecutors present in this courtroom that Maria told
 2
   Yolanda that she wanted to go along because she was
 3
   leaving and she was having relations with the man.
              THE COURT: In the testimony that my law clerk
 4
 5
   typed up for me, which I asked her to do so I would have
 6
   it handy, there is one question that I think Mr. Santiago
 7
   said --
 8
              MR. RICCO: Mr. Martinez, your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: You know, you're getting me
   confused with Santiago and Martinez.
10
              MR. RICCO: I know.
11
12
              THE COURT: This is Mr. Santiago who's
13
   questioning.
14
              MR. RICCO: Who's questioning, yes, Judge.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. And this is Yolanda I
16
   believe.
17
              MR. RICCO: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: "You also told them that you asked
19
   Maria if you could go up there and clean with her and
20
   Maria said no. Correct?" Yolanda, "Yes. I asked her if
21
   I could go and she said no," which is one of the many
   things that troubles me about the evidence in this case
22
23
   and the quality of the evidence in this case.
24
              MR. RICCO: Yes, it --
25
              THE COURT: Of course the jury acquitted on
```

23 Proceedings 1 that particular count. 2 MR. RICCO: They did. And Judge --3 THE COURT: And it still raises in the overall picture why she even went down there. She was about to 4 be released. This was within a couple of days, a couple 5 6 of weeks, I don't remember her projected release date. 7 And --MR. RICCO: Well, Judge, what --8 9 THE COURT: -- being a question from her own 10 testimony (indiscernible) physically he came -- he just 11 had come back to work from what looked like some complex 12 hernia surgery, how competent he was to engage in violent 13 physical activity. So even though she did go back on 14 what she told the FBI agent, and what she told the FBI 15 agent is in evidence, that's part of what's stipulated 16 that if the agent testified that's what she would say. 17 MR. RICCO: Yes. 18 THE COURT: But she did say that Yolanda said 19 that she said to Maria do you want me to come with you, 20 and I find that -- that's one of the many aspects of 21 Maria's testimony that I find troubling. 22 MR. RICCO: And Judge, to me what makes it 23 difficult for sentencing purposes is that I don't get it, I missed something here, the very statements that 24 25 provided the basis of us having a retrial in the first

24 Proceedings place, the witness takes the stand and denies that she 1 2 ever made them. 3 THE COURT: But she admits she made a significant one. The question was that she went back on 4 why did she, and I'm only paraphrasing, is essentially 5 6 why didn't she want you to go she may have said something 7 it's because I have a relationship with him. That's the 8 part that I think she went back on. 9 MR. RICCO: Yes. But Judge, she does --10 THE COURT: But that was in front of the jury 11 as well because the agent's summary of notes was there. 12 MR. RICCO: Well, yeah. And Judge, to me that 13 is the most important part of it because it really calls 14 into question when you look at the totality of the 15 evidence, you look at the other officers who testified 16 who said we never saw any stress. She was always escorted down. The officers escorted her back and forth 17 18 and they never saw any distress. They're talking. Don't know what 19 THE COURT: 20 to make of that. But let's say they said that. It's 21 still a question of this going down, stop in February 22 after the strange Facebook --23 MR. RICCO: Facebook call. 24 THE COURT: -- call in which she was obviously 25 trying to find out personal information about the

25 Proceedings defendant which would have corroborated her interest in a 1 2 relationship with him. And then when he found out about 3 it and she found out about it, it stopped. He stopped calling her. And then there was this last one and she 4 5 could have presumably have avoided it. And you know, 6 we're dealing here with, I mean you know you're dealing 7 with people who are in jail who are not people of the 8 highest moral character and who all have problems. 9 But this last April 16th, April visit whenever 10 it was --11 MR. RICCO: April 16th. 12 THE COURT: April 16th. It's one of the --13 that and the Facebook call are one of the things that I 14 have terrible qualms about. But she was acquitted. 15 MR. RICCO: Yes, Judge. So I really -- I mean 16 we wrote so much about sentencing that I know that the 17 Court has a firm grasp on the points that we want to 18 make. 19 THE COURT: Don't assume anything. 20 MR. RICCO: I generally don't, Judge. But I 21 will say this. What the Court doesn't know about is the 22 many hours that were spent with Carlos Martinez, his very 23 depression that we saw after the second verdict. He 24 looked horrible, lost. You know, he's doing much better. 25 He's hopeful for his future. He knows he has a lot of

26 Proceedings building to do. He has to rebuild his life, rebuild his 1 2 relationship with his daughter who, by the way, is going 3 to college now, his youngest daughter started in college. And Judge, his aunt is present here today. 4 She's seated in the first row. And there was a time when 5 6 we tried this case the courtroom was packed. All the 7 correction officers were here and different people. And 8 the one lady stayed throughout, she's been to every 9 proceeding, and Carlos, as you recall, Judge, Carlos 10 Martinez's mother died while he was detained in this 11 case. We had made an application to try to get him there 12 and weren't able to. And his mother's sister has 13 remained very supportive of her nephew. She's heard the 14 testimony. She believes in him. She has strong 15 religious beliefs, and the defendant does too. And he's 16 never lost that. I could go on but I'm not. 17 THE COURT: Well notwithstanding the fact that 18 I am concerned about whether false testimony was given by 19 the complainant and the jury found that, I still have the 20 quilty verdict which I can't set aside. MR. RICCO: That's true. 21 22 THE COURT: And it's a forcible rape by a 23 prison quard and --MR. RICCO: So Judge, I have to --24 25 THE COURT: I could say, and this is not a

Proceedings

defense to him, but one of the things that's been bothering me about this is I believe, and again I want to repeat, that this is not a defense at all to him, that the MDC has been at an enabler of these rapes. I had one case involving Clark Mullins who you didn't charge. When I say you, Ms. Geddes, I don't mean you personally, but the U.S. Attorney's Office didn't charge him with forcible rape. And when I read the testimony, I mean I believe it was a guilty plea, but when I read it, I upwardly departed I think it was to eight and a half years because it seemed to me I couldn't understand why this wasn't charged as a violent rape.

Judge Ross's case involved five separate -- and I know you divide it up and you want to make it look a little less terrible in terms of comparing sentences, but it involved one officer and five I believe women who were subject to one form or another of sexual assaults. We'll just use the word loosely. Two of them may have been violent rapes. And now I have this case. So that's seven. And when I say the MDC was an enabler, it wasn't that there were that many incidents, but they send women to clean the office of male officers. The officers are not under close circuit surveillance. But the setup is, as you went through all the pictures, was that the officer inside the office can see what was going on

outside and see if anybody was coming.

And the final step in this enabling processes is when a complaint is made, whether the testimony was not entirely clear whether it was temporary or more than that, the complainant is put in the SHU which is solitary confinement 23 hours a day. And that's how this system works or has worked. And I don't know what's going on. I mean there was some indication in a note that Mr. Ricco sent me last night that there's some separate Department of Justice investigation that's going on. This is just inexcusable. They are enablers of what's going on.

And then I have the warden who has the nerve to write me a sentencing letter in this case when I suspect that the warden who was there when these things were going on was probably permitted to retire without consequence. And it's just shocking, shocking degree to which the Bureau of Prisons at the MDC enabled this to happen. No one had the foresight to think we shouldn't send women, and in effect it's almost a degree of sexism which is the least of the crimes to send a woman in to clean as opposed to men. So I just --

MR. RICCO: Judge, what I wanted to add, and it is --

THE COURT: And I want to make it clear this is not a defense to any guard who committed a rape. It's

```
29
                            Proceedings
1
   not a defense. But these crimes were enabled by the
 2
   people who ran the Bureau of Prisons. And that's one of
 3
   the things that's really bothered me through these cases
   that I've had.
 4
 5
              Go ahead. I'm sorry if I interrupted you.
 6
              MR. RICCO: Yes. So Judge, along those lines,
7
   and these arguments that I'm making are really in
 8
   mitigation of sentencing, not of guilt.
 9
              THE COURT: No, no, no. I know.
10
              MR. RICCO: And I would say this, Judge, the
11
   case that --
12
              THE COURT: Well I wanted to get to that.
13
   That's what I wanted to get to. I wanted to get to the
14
   issue of sentencing because these are serious crimes in
15
   an institution like that, assuming it was committed, and
16
   I have to accept the jury's verdict despite my own qualms
17
   about her credibility. It's ultimately a credibility
18
   determination. I couldn't set aside the verdict even if
19
   you had timely moved on that count.
20
              MR. RICCO: Judge, the case that
21
    (indiscernible) --
              THE CLERK: The microphone.
22
23
              MR. RICCO: Sorry. The case that you upwardly
24
   departed about that you mentioned, I'm familiar with
25
   that.
```

```
30
                            Proceedings
                          That was Clark Mullins.
              THE COURT:
1
 2
              MR. RICCO: Yes, Judge. And I'm familiar with
 3
   that case and your Honor's ruling with respect to that
 4
   case.
 5
              THE COURT: You were the original lawyer and
 6
   then he was stupid enough to get somebody else.
 7
              MR. RICCO: Well, I agree with that. But I do
 8
   know, Judge, that having read your concerns, I get it. I
 9
   mean it was. I mean it was a prosecutorial decision was
10
   made to allow a person to plead to a count just involving
11
   a ward thing. But --
12
              THE COURT: Maybe the government had their own
13
   qualms about the credibility of the witness. I don't
14
   know.
15
              MR. RICCO: They may have. I don't know,
16
   Judge.
17
              THE COURT: Occasionally I think about it
18
   particularly since I've immersed myself in this
19
   particular case.
20
              MR. RICCO: And then Judge, the other case was
21
   a case that involved many of these same, several of these
22
   same witnesses involving the case in front of Judge
23
   Matsumoto. And that defendant's conduct dated back to
24
   2013. And tried by the same prosecutorial team. His
25
   guidelines were life also. He was convicted of forcible
```

```
31
                            Proceedings
   rape, multi-counts of it. There were no acquittals in
1
 2
   that case.
 3
              THE COURT: I know but --
              MR. RICCO: I'm just saying this, Judge. The
 4
 5
   sentence that was imposed --
 6
              THE COURT: Ms. Geddes has broken it down so
7
   that you can't say they're Rule 5 forcible rapes.
              MR. RICCO: Well there were no -- there was
 8
 9
   some differences but he was convicted --
10
              THE COURT: Yes, I know. But there were five
11
   separate instances of improper, we'll just use that word,
12
   neutral word, sexual contact.
13
              MR. RICCO: And even one --
14
              THE COURT: Including one at least, I don't
15
   remember --
16
              MR. RICCO: Right. And then there was one
17
   count --
18
              THE COURT: -- whether it was one or two of
19
   forcible rape.
20
              MR. RICCO: There was one count standing alone
21
   of an attempted. But the fact of the matter, Judge, is
22
   that the kind of time that the government is requesting
23
   in here is just disproportionate and disparate given
24
   sentences that are imposed for the same kind of facility
25
   by people who have engaged in far more egregious conduct
```

with far more women. I'm sure that their investigation is what it is involving this woman who testified here.

We had asked that the Court consider a sentence of 60 months. And why? Five years in prison is a long time. It's not a light sentence. I represented a defendant here who was charged with having sex with a ward and one count and she received a sentence of a year and a day. Different circumstance obviously as each individual case is different. And I'm a great believer that defendants are entitled to an individual assessment of who they are in their case.

I mention it because of fairness in sentencing. We don't lose fairness at the time of sentence. It's probably the time where fairness needs to be at its highest level because of the loss of liberty and everything that goes along with it.

The last five years for Carlos Martinez have been very harsh. He's been through COVID. And many judges of this court, your Honor included, have granted relief to defendants at sentencing because of it. Carlos Martinez endured that also in addition to the circumstances of his detainment resulting from the type of charge and the fact that he's a law enforcement officer.

It's probably been the most difficult time -- I

know that it's been the most difficult time at least in my career that defendants have had to endure being incarcerated. And it's a factor that I would ask the Court to consider.

I'm familiar with your Honor's sentence, Mr.

Mullins. And I guess I arrived at the suggestion based upon the involvement of COVID and the two years that Mr.

Martinez endured as a result of that was not present. I don't know if your Honor would have considered that as an issue in the Mullins case or not or to what extent, or to what extent it should be considered here. But it is a factor. It is a real-time factor that affected the defendant. It was a part of his punishment.

But I can tell the Court that my belief is that the defendant before the Court, if the word atone means anything, that he's gone through that process that everyone would expect all of the defendants to do, and that has happened for him. That I'm confident of because we've had to endure such a long time with this case. Not because of the government or anything. Two years of it has been COVID. But if there's a such thing as unintended consequences, the unintended consequences of that is that it provided a time period for reflection, isolation, and for Mr. Martinez to regroup.

And I don't have anything else to add, Judge.

THE COURT: One of the things that I said when I departed upwardly in Clark Mullins in terms of the factors that go into the sentencing guidelines, it's not a question of deterring him in terms of deterrence being one of those factors. I don't think anybody thinks that

I don't. It's all been said. It's all in the papers.

he's going to go out and become a serial rapist. This

happened because of a particular circumstance that lent

9 itself to it.

But what message do I send? And I said this to guards at the MDC, I've already tried to send a message to the MDC to the extent they never pay any attention to what judges think. What message do I send to people who are at the MDC. I mean that to me is I think --

MR. RICCO: Judge, I think --

THE COURT: -- this is a serious crime in terms of the 3553(a) factors. I don't think there's any -- there's no doubt in my mind that he is not going to go out and rape anyone if he's released. He's not a violent criminal. He's led an otherwise admirable life in terms of the factors that we went through near the outset of your presentation. But you know, to what extent do I impose a sentence that would be imposed if it was simply purely consensual and it was simply a ward situation. I mean that's the thing that I'm somewhat torn by, that and

```
35
                            Proceedings
   the fact that I'm concerned about her veracity as a
1
 2
   witness.
 3
              MR. RICCO: Judge, I still take the position
   that five years in prison is a powerful --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: I don't quarrel with that. There
 6
   are times when I have conversations with my law clerks,
 7
   maybe not with this group because of COVID we haven't
 8
   spent as much time with each other. But I'd say a year
 9
   doesn't sound like a lot unless you have to serve it.
10
   And five years is an awful lot. I'm aware of that. But
11
   you know, there are other considerations I have to take
12
   into account.
13
              All right. Shall we hear from the government
14
   and then your client? Or do you want me to hear from
15
   your client and then the government?
16
              MR. RICCO: Let's hear from the government and
17
   then Mr. Martinez can respond to what they have to say
18
   about him.
19
              THE COURT: I need to take my mask off to take
20
   a drink of water.
21
              MS. SHIHATA: Should I proceed or --
22
              THE COURT: I think I can drink water and
23
   listen to you at the same time.
24
              MS. SHIHATA: I'm sure you can. I'm sure you
25
   can. Thank you, your Honor.
```

Proceedings

I would just like to start by indicating that the government does not agree that the only reasonable conclusion that the Court can draw from the jury's verdict is that they did not credit Maria's testimony. I think an equally reasonable conclusion and frankly one that is supported by the jury's verdict is laid out on page 5 of our October 28, 2021 letter.

And I want to take us back for a moment to the evidence and the testimony in this case regarding the first incident where the jury found the defendant guilty of aggravated sexual abuse.

THE COURT: I'm not questioning the verdict.

MS. SHIHATA: I understand, but it informs the rest of what I'm going to say. So if the Court would indulge me, I'd appreciate it.

With respect to the factual scenario of that incident, the evidence was that the defendant had called Maria down to clean the second floor area and that during the course of the interaction in the lieutenant's office, he pinned her down on the desk, pulled her pants down, and forcibly raped her from behind with such an amount of physical force that ultimately resulted in her bleeding.

Now I think that's important --

THE COURT: She testified -- I don't want to get into all of this stuff.

```
37
                            Proceedings
1
              MS. SHIHATA: She did testify to that, but
 2
   there was --
 3
              THE COURT: She testified that the bleeding was
   due to the fact that she had not had sexual intercourse
 4
 5
   in some time.
 6
              MS. SHIHATA: She may believe that --
 7
              THE COURT: Now I know Ms. Geddes at some
8
   point in the transcript --
 9
              MS. SHIHATA: -- but I don't think
10
   scientifically that that's how it works.
11
              THE COURT: -- said that that wasn't so but I
12
   believe it's on page 79 that --
13
              MS. SHIHATA: I believe that was in the first
14
   trial if I'm remembering. I don't think --
15
              THE COURT: No, I think it was --
16
              MS. SHIHATA: Anyway --
17
              THE COURT: Unless I have the wrong transcript.
18
              MS. SHIHATA: -- be that as it may, the jury
19
   could certainly infer and conclude, as it did I
20
   believe --
              THE COURT: They found it. I didn't say they
21
22
   didn't --
23
              MS. SHIHATA: Okay. But the reason it's
   important, Judge --
24
25
              THE COURT: -- credit her testimony on that
```

38 Proceedings count. They did. 1 2 MS. SHIHATA: Understood. But the reason it's 3 important, Judge, is because the fear element can also be a fear of the use of that amount of physical force. So 4 for example, if she is fearful that he is going to use 5 6 that amount to get her to submit, that's a fear under the 7 law that even though he used some lesser amount of 8 physical force, and that qualifies and is consistent with 9 the jury's verdict. Your Honor may disagree with me. It 10 appears that you do. But I want to make the record clear that there is a conclusion that can be drawn from the 11 12 evidence that entirely credits Maria's testimony. And 13 that actually fits the verdict that was rendered by the 14 jury in this case. 15 THE COURT: Well that's not what the jury was charged and that's not the way --16 17 MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, they were charged. 18 They were --19 THE COURT: It's not the way you charged it and 20 it's not --21 MS. SHIHATA: I disagree, but I'll move on. 22 THE COURT: It's not clear to me that your 23 construction of the statute is correct. She did not say 24 this. You're putting those words in her mouth. 25 MS. SHIHATA: A jury is permitted to draw

```
39
                            Proceedings
   inferences from the evidence though, Judge.
1
 2
              THE COURT: Could you tell me that she said
 3
   what you just said?
              MS. SHIHATA: Sorry, I didn't hear you. I
 4
 5
   apologize.
 6
              THE COURT: That she gave the reason for
 7
   acquiescing because she was afraid that the next time he
 8
   was going to use force.
 9
              MS. SHIHATA: Judge, it is not --
10
              THE COURT: Could you answer that?
              MS. SHIHATA: I don't believe she --
11
12
              THE COURT: That only requires a yes or no.
              MS. SHIHATA: No, she did not explicitly say
13
14
   that.
15
              THE COURT: She did not say that, no.
16
              MS. SHIHATA: But it is also clearly the law,
17
   Judge, that a jury can draw inferences from the evidence
18
   and that is a valid inference to draw. You may not have
19
   agreed and you may not have drawn that inference but the
20
   jury certainly could.
21
              THE COURT: I might have. The question is --
22
   I'm not saying I agree or disagree. I just think that
23
   the question is what caused her to consent to the extent
24
   there was consent if she consented as opposed to each
25
   time he approached her.
```

40 Proceedings MS. SHIHATA: There's a difference --1 2 THE COURT: As you described it in your letter, 3 there was no conversation. He just violently assaulted her each time. 4 MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, knowing the 5 6 consequences --7 THE COURT: And in each case you describe it in 8 your opening statement as rape. 9 MS. SHIHATA: Rape is not just physical force, 10 your Honor. THE COURT: Now it's one thing if she said that 11 12 the reason that I -- she didn't say she acquiesced, but the reason I went along, the reason I didn't fight was 13 14 because I was afraid. The fact is that she actually did 15 fight on one occasion. 16 MS. SHIHATA: She did. And he then threatened 17 her with five years in prison. He said do you know what 18 you could get for that? Which is entirely consistent 19 with the government's theory, Judge. 20 THE COURT: What you could get for assaulting a 21 federal officer, a prison guard or a prison officer. 22 MS. SHIHATA: Yes, but it has to be looked at 23 in the context of what was going on, Judge. And by the 24 way, she did testify that she was scared. And there is 25 case law I believe from the Fifth or the Eighth

```
41
                            Proceedings
   Circuit --
1
 2
              THE COURT: I know she was scared. Why did she
 3
   go down there on the last time?
              MS. SHIHATA: Because he was -- she is an
 4
   inmate, she doesn't get to decide that she's not going to
 5
 6
   go down when a lieutenant, who's the highest ranking
7
   person in jail at the time says --
 8
              THE COURT: She was asked by another prisoner
 9
   whether she wanted to be accompanied. And it was also
10
   quite near the end --
              MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, Otis Delacruz did
11
12
    testify at the trial --
13
              THE COURT: It was also --
14
              MS. SHIHATA: -- and did not recall that.
15
              THE COURT: It was also right near the end of
16
   her prison sentence. Days away.
17
              MS. SHIHATA: Exactly, Judge. And she wanted
18
   to get out of the MDC which was a horrible place for her
19
   where these things occurred. Judge, I'm not trying to
20
   convince you at this point but I think the record is --
21
              THE COURT: The record is that the jury found
22
   what they found and they found him not guilty.
23
              MS. SHIHATA: And they found him guilty of
24
   sexual abuse using fear.
25
              THE COURT: And they did, they found him --
```

```
42
                            Proceedings
1
              MS. SHIHATA: Of not just aggravated sexual
 2
   abuse.
 3
              THE COURT: I don't --
              MS. SHIHATA: You may disagree with them but
 4
 5
   that is in fact what the verdict was. And that's all I'm
   saying is that there is evidence from which the jury
 6
 7
   could reach that verdict. I understand that you
 8
   disagree. I am simply making a record that there was in
   fact evidence about it.
 9
10
              THE COURT: Okay. There was. Let's assume
11
   you're right --
12
              MS. SHIHATA: But now I will move on.
13
              THE COURT: I'm not sure what that adds to the
14
   discussion we're having.
15
              MS. SHIHATA: Okay. I think what it adds,
16
   Judge --
17
              THE COURT: Because the worst part of what he
18
   did was physically assaulted her each time as you
19
   describe it in your letter and as you characterized it in
20
   your opening statement.
21
              MS. SHIHATA: I agree, Judge, that is the worst
22
   part and that is the most serious.
23
              THE COURT: I don't think that there was any
24
   adequate response in the summation to the call, I keep
25
   calling it a call, to the Facebook investigation.
```

43 Proceedings MS. SHIHATA: 1 There was testimony. And I'm not 2 trying to retry this case, Judge, at the sentencing but 3 there was testimony --THE COURT: No, some of the stuff is relevant. 4 5 MS. SHIHATA: Understood. And I would like to 6 remind your Honor, and I'm sure it sounds like you read 7 the transcript and are fully familiar with the records 8 are not trying to suggest otherwise, but there was 9 testimony about the reasons that she made that call in an 10 effort to make the abuse stop. And she thought that he 11 would be listening to it and that this would help. 12 THE COURT: Then she knew that if she -- you 13 know, you're going around in a somewhat conflicting 14 argument. 15 MS. SHIHATA: Judge, the one thing --16 THE COURT: She was afraid to make a complaint 17 but in effect she was doing something that would in 18 effect be the equivalent in terms of her tormentor 19 finding out what she was doing. 20 MS. SHIHATA: She believed he was listening to 21 her calls. The point was not so that --22 THE COURT: And why was the request made about 23 whether he was married or not and why were questions 24 asked about the women who were in the pictures? 25 MS. SHIHATA: Because she wanted him to be

```
44
                            Proceedings
   concerned that she had made this call and concerned
1
 2
   enough that he would stop. Your Honor, the one thing
 3
    that's clear from the evidence is that --
              THE COURT: Well, the call could have
 4
 5
   indicated --
 6
              MS. SHIHATA: -- she did not know --
 7
              THE COURT: The call could have indicated to
 8
   this person, we'll call it a call, whatever, I don't know
 9
   from Facebook, but it could have, if that was her
10
   concern, she could have said I'm being sexually assaulted
11
   by a lieutenant.
              MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, she believed because
12
13
   of what he told her --
14
              THE COURT: That would put a stop to it. In
15
   fact, this call put a stop to it.
16
              MS. SHIHATA: She believed that because of what
17
   he told her that if she reported that explicitly she
18
   would go to the SHU as punishment. Okay? Now were there
19
   better ways for her to report this? Absolutely.
20
              THE COURT: Well she didn't go to the SHU and
21
   it had the exact same effect.
22
              MS. SHIHATA: She didn't go to the SHU because
23
   she didn't report it, Judge. And it didn't have the
24
   exact same effect. He sexually abused her one more time.
25
              THE COURT: She knew that he would find out
```

45 Proceedings about the call and he did. 1 2 MS. SHIHATA: Yes, he found out about the call 3 because Tomas Rodriguez, the SIS officer, told him about it which was not actually the protocol that he should 4 have followed. 5 6 THE COURT: And it may be but you just told me 7 it would have the effect of putting, you know, she wanted 8 to put a stop to it. 9 MS. SHIHATA: I told you that that's what she 10 believed. THE COURT: All right. That's what she 11 12 believed. 13 MS. SHIHATA: I think we should also 14 acknowledge, your Honor, she was in her twenties at the 15 time. Would I have gone about things that way? No, of 16 course not. But she's in the situation she's in. 17 THE COURT: Well, she had a --18 MS. SHIHATA: And she was doing the best she 19 could to try to make this stop. 20 Now the point, Judge, my only point in raising 21 these points is that inferences can be drawn in favor of 22 the jury's verdict and not against it and that the 23 evidence does not -- the only conclusion that one could 24 draw, which is what your Honor suggested, is that she was 25 not telling the truth.

Proceedings

46

THE COURT: The jury was not charged in a way 1 2 that would support that verdict. But it's neither here 3 nor there because in my view she never testified that the reason that she made no effort to -- this is a case of 4 forcible rape under her testimony. That's the bottom 5 line. It wasn't a case where she said I was caused to do 6 7 this because I was in fear of threats or force and you 8 acknowledge that she never said that that was what 9 motivated her. What motivated her throughout this was 10 that essentially forcing her. And the jury didn't believe that. 11 12 MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, I disagree. I don't 13 acknowledge that. What I acknowledge was that there can 14 be more than one causative element and that it was both 15 physical force and threats and fear. 16 THE COURT: The one that you argued was the one 17 that was consistent with what I was saying. And when I 18 say you, I'm separating you from Ms. Geddes who gave a 19 somewhat more subtle summation. Maybe nuanced is a 20 better word. I don't know. 21 MS. SHIHATA: Anyway at this point, your Honor, 22 let me move on towards the --23 THE COURT: In fact, the person who wrote the 24 pre-sentence report said she was raped all the time.

MS. SHIHATA: I would just like to note, Judge,

25

```
47
                            Proceedings
1
   forcible rape does not require physical force. A person
 2
   can be forced through the use of fear and threats as
 3
   well.
              THE COURT: Okay.
 4
 5
              MS. SHIHATA: And any rate, I will move on now
 6
   to the Section 3553(a) factors for the Court.
 7
              THE COURT: But I hate to get involved with
 8
   these legal debates. The deprivation of rights charge,
 9
   and I think I may have given what you asked for, said
10
   they had to find him guilty of aggravated sexual abuse in
   order to find him guilty of deprivation of rights.
11
12
              MS. SHIHATA: And in turn quilty --
13
              THE COURT: That was right in there. That's
14
   why you create problems by making up four separate
15
   counts, four separate crimes for what is essentially one
16
   for each discrete act. But the specific charge on the
17
   deprivation of rights was they had to find aggravated
18
   sexual abuse and they didn't find it except on one count.
19
              MS. SHIHATA: I'm not disagreeing with your
20
   Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Okay.
22
              MS. SHIHATA: Okay. So moving on to the
   section 3553(a) factors.
23
24
              THE COURT: And by the way, I got your
25
   second -- you sent me a second victim impact statement.
```

48 Proceedings 1 MS. SHIHATA: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. 2 THE COURT: I assume that Mr. Ricco got it. 3 MS. SHIHATA: Yeah, it was filed on ECF, Judge. MR. RICCO: We did. 4 5 THE COURT: And let me just say something about 6 It sounded familiar to me. And the reason it 7 sounded familiar to me was because of the discussion we 8 may have had at the end of what she told Immigration and 9 Naturalization in support of her claim for I quess it's a 10 T visa, that she had been sexually trafficked. And you 11 can read the testimony yourself, it just sounded awfully familiar to me in terms of statements that she was 12 13 making. That's also neither here nor there. And I don't 14 purport to be an expert on the effect that the horrible 15 claims that she made to the INS or to Immigration somehow 16 would have prevented her from the sufferings that she 17 described in the letter. All I'm suggesting is that when 18 I read the letter I said why does this sound familiar? 19 And I went back and I read the argument about the 20 stipulation. But go ahead. 21 MS. SHIHATA: With respect to the Section 22 3553(a) factors, I think as the Court has recognized 23 these are serious crimes. I would respect what the Court 24 said regarding the MDC being an enabler. I think on that 25 you and I wholeheartedly agree.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

49

THE COURT: Well you and the Bureau of Prisons, I think one of you may have even said this in the transcript somewhere, are part of the Department of Justice and the one good thing about this is unlike New York where there is no single agency that oversees the enforcement of the criminal laws where people can blame each other, is that the Department of Justice has oversight over you and the Bureau of Prisons. You're not separate agencies. And the Bureau of Prisons in my view, not only here but in many other respects, operates in a manner that leaves a lot to be desired. In fact, somebody should ask for the ombudsman of the Department of Justice to look into how the MDC is being run here including the sexist business of sending women to be cleaners as opposed to man where women make actually a relatively small percentage of the population of the MDC as I understand it. MS. SHIHATA: Understood, Judge. And like I said, I don't disagree with the Court what you said about the MDC. THE COURT: Well, you should try and do something about it. MS. SHIHATA: I actually have, Judge. I'm

happy to talk to you about that offline.

50 Proceedings THE COURT: Not you personally. The U.S. 1 2 Attorney should do it. 3 MS. SHIHATA: Understood. THE COURT: Another good thing about the 4 5 Department of Justice that people don't always realize is 6 that the U.S. Attorney is an appointee of the president 7 and therefore has a certain degree of independence 8 notwithstanding the fact that there is an attorney 9 general. Only the president can fire a U.S. Attorney and 10 that gives the U.S. Attorney one significant advantage. 11 And the other significant advantage that it gives the 12 U.S. Attorney is that he stands on the same footing as 13 presidential appointees in the Department of Justice 14 including the head of the Bureau of Prisons. And if 15 anything is going to come of it, it should be in a letter 16 from U.S. Attorney. But we're going off on a tangent and 17 I don't want to go off on it any further. 18 MS. SHIHATA: So moving back to the 3553(a) 19 factors, Judge, the additional point I wanted to make on 20 that issue is that the testimony and the evidence at the 21 trial certainly established that the defendant used the 22 tools that the MDC provided him with. And he does have 23 agency in this scenario. He decided to call Maria to 24 clean for him. He did that is a high ranking official at 25 the jail. He did that at times when he knew the second

Proceedings

floor would be empty. He used the tools he had access to including the security camera systems.

THE COURT: Let me ask you something. I don't mean to interrupt but I am interrupting. There was some ambiguity in the record. I don't know if it ever got straightened out in terms of the jury knowing about it. He testified, or there was testimony that she had a job, she had what one would describe as a full-time job five days a week working in the medical unit. And this weekend work, I don't know what the truth is, but there was an ambiguity in the record as to whether this was quote voluntary or she had to work on weekends in addition to the full-time, what I would characterize as the full-time job that she had Monday through Friday.

MS. SHIHATA: She didn't work Monday through Friday, Judge. Her job was actually to work at those times and --

THE COURT: I'm sorry I don't know what you mean those times. I thought the testimony was that she worked in the medical unit and that she worked in the medical unit unless she was off, she worked in the medical unit five days a week and she worked for him on weekends.

MS. SHIHATA: There was also testimony, Judge, from both MDC legal counsel I believe, Nicole McFarland,

52 Proceedings as well as from Otis Delacruz, the witness the defendant 1 2 called, that when Maria was called on the weekends that 3 she was required to go and that she couldn't just say no. And in fact --4 5 THE COURT: And maybe you could send me that 6 testimony. I don't remember it. I know --7 MS. SHIHATA: I can cite it for you now, Judge. 8 THE COURT: My recollection was that this came 9 up in terms of the jury note, certain pages were sent in 10 to the jury from the transcript as being responsive to 11 their note, and I thought that there was an ambiguity in 12 the pages of the transcript that were sent in to the 13 jury. Now I could be wrong. This is a long transcript 14 and I spent a lot of time reading it. 15 MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, I recall that we had 16 extensive argument about it. I recall that. And I --17 THE COURT: That was a part that dealt with --18 it was a jury note. 19 MS. SHIHATA: Yes, your Honor. We had --20 THE COURT: And it dealt with how a jury note 21 would be answered. And ultimately an agreement was 22 reached that here are the pages in the record that are 23 responsive to your note. 24 MS. SHIHATA: Yes. 25 THE COURT: And I looked at those pages and it

53 Proceedings didn't seem to me that they provided a clear answer. 1 2 MS. SHIHATA: Included in those pages, I 3 believe your Honor, was testimony from Otis Delacruz, who was called by the defendant. And she indicated quote, 4 5 "You don't do what you're supposed to do they will write 6 you up." That's at page 671 of the transcript. 7 THE COURT: I know, but if you don't do what you're supposed to do they'll write you up, depends on 8 9 what you're supposed to do. 10 MS. SHIHATA: And it was in the context, Judge, 11 of Maria going down, being told to go down to clean. 12 THE COURT: What page in the transcript? MS. SHIHATA: 671. And she also states she, 13 14 quote, "She had to clean it, that's what she had to 15 clean." She also said that Maria, and I'm only focusing 16 on this because you mentioned Otis Delacruz, but Otis testified that Maria would ask her in fact on the 17 18 weekends whether she could go down to clean with her and 19 Otis told her no, I have visits on the weekend, I'm not 20 going. THE COURT: I don't know that it was every 21 22 weekend but I do remember that. 23 MS. SHIHATA: And the reason --24 THE COURT: But there's also testimony that on 25 the last time somebody said do you want me to go and she

54 Proceedings said no. 1 MS. SHIHATA: Yes. And there was also an 2 3 explanation from Yolanda that that was in the context of Maria was leaving the MDC shortly and she specifically 4 5 warned Yolanda don't go to the second floor. I think a 6 reasonable inference from that testimony, from Yolanda's 7 testimony, is that Maria was warning Yolanda, because she 8 didn't want the same thing to start happening to her. 9 Yolanda was also a young attractive Spanish female at the 10 MDC. Now these are certainly inferences that can be 11 12 drawn from the evidence and --13 THE COURT: Could you just wait one second? 14 I honestly don't see on page 671 where that deals 15 with the question that I asked. 16 MS. SHIHATA: I don't have the transcript in 17 front of me. I had that note. 18 THE COURT: I tried and I may have missed it 19 but --20 MS. SHIHATA: No, I understand, but I don't 21 want to --22 THE COURT: When it went into the jury, they 23 said this were the pages that are responsive to your 24 note. And I said why don't we attach the pages and 25 somebody said well they already have the transcript.

```
55
                            Proceedings
    the pages were specifically -- the record reflects that
 1
 2
    the pages that were sent in to the jury. All I'm saying
    is is that it was unclear to me from the pages that went
 3
   in as to whether or not this was voluntary.
 4
 5
              MS. SHIHATA: So we submit that it was not
 6
    and --
 7
              THE COURT: I know, but you can only submit
    what's in the record.
 8
 9
              MS. SHIHATA: Well, if I had known, Judge, that
10
    this was what your Honor was going to ask me to do to re-
   prove the entire case, perhaps I could have but --
11
12
              THE COURT: Look, sentencing people is very
13
    serious business --
14
              MS. SHIHATA: Of course.
15
              THE COURT: -- which I take very seriously.
16
   And the amount of time that it took me to read the
17
    transcript, I could have tried a short case. So you
18
    know, if I read the transcript, you should read the
19
    transcript.
20
              MS. SHIHATA: I have, Judge, but I have --
21
    anyway, I'll move on, Judge.
22
              The point is this is a serious crime and of
23
    course sentencing someone is probably the most difficult
24
    task that any judge has to do in their job. The
25
    government certainly understands that. And the
```

```
56
                            Proceedings
   government also understands the mitigating factors that
1
 2
   Mr. Ricco so ably mentioned. And of course the Court
 3
   should also consider the other good works that Mr.
   Martinez has done in his life.
 4
              But we can also not forget that this is in fact
 5
   a serious crime, that there is in fact a victim of this
 6
 7
   crime involved here. And this has also had a hugely
   detrimental effect on her life. It is not easy for
 8
 9
   someone to get up on a witness stand over the course of
10
   multiple days to talk about the worst experience of their
11
   lives.
12
              THE COURT: I'm not sure that it was multiple
13
   days.
14
              MS. SHIHATA: It was, Judge. It was two
15
   days --
16
              THE COURT: Okay, two days.
              MS. SHIHATA: -- in the first trial and two
17
18
   days in the second trial. I think you can give me that
19
   that it's multiple days.
20
              THE COURT: I'm sorry. I was concentrating on
21
   the second trial.
22
              MS. SHIHATA: Okay. Even on the second trial I
23
   believe it was more than one day.
              THE COURT: And her testimony was really not
24
25
   that long. It was a thin transcript the first time.
```

```
57
                            Proceedings
   Look, I don't want to get involved in how -- I think you
 1
 2
    should try --
 3
              MS. SHIHATA: Judge, my only point, and you may
   disagree with it --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: I think you should try --
 6
              MS. SHIHATA: -- is that it is not easy for
 7
    someone to testify --
 8
              THE COURT: I think you should try to not get
 9
    carried away.
10
              MS. SHIHATA: I don't think I'm getting carried
    away when I say --
11
12
              THE COURT: She was not a stranger to the
13
    criminal justice system.
14
              MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, even people convicted
15
   of --
16
              THE COURT: I don't remember all of the things
   now that Mr. Ricco alluded to.
17
18
              MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor --
19
              THE COURT: But she was not a stranger to the
20
    criminal justice system.
21
              MS. SHIHATA: And no one claimed that she was.
22
   But even people who aren't strangers to the criminal
23
   justice system deserve not to be sexually abused when
24
    they're serving their sentence.
25
              THE COURT: I agree with that completely.
```

58 Proceedings 1 MS. SHIHATA: Okay. Great. I'm glad we 2 reached agreement on that. 3 THE COURT: And in fact, as I said earlier, who is going to be in the MDC to begin with? 4 5 MS. SHIHATA: Which is why it makes it so 6 hard --7 THE COURT: People who have been charged with crimes. Not all of them have long criminal records but 8 9 they are people who have been charged with crimes. I 10 agree with that. And in part, that's what makes this a 11 serious crime because they're subject to the control of 12 quards and the overall prison personnel. 13 MS. SHIHATA: In that regard, Judge, I also 14 would like to point out that, as your Honor knows and I'm 15 sure has read again more recently, the defendant chose to 16 testify in the second trial and that's of course his 17 right. But also the jury's verdict make clear that he 18 lied during that testimony. He didn't just say this was 19 consensual, which in the government's view is not what 20 happened, and also in the jury's view, but also he went a 21 step further. He completely negated the power 22 differential that certainly exists in a prison between a 23 lieutenant and a sentenced prisoner. He couldn't even --24 he suggested incredibly, I'd argue, that Maria was the 25 aggressor even though she was not the one controlling the

Proceedings

cameras. She was not the one that knew the schedules at the place. Your Honor, it is certainly a relevant factor that he did not tell the truth at the trial. It is certainly a relative factor that he was a lieutenant and she was a sentenced prisoner. It is certainly a relevant factor that whether the Court believes it or not, this has had an effect on her life.

THE COURT: It's not a question of what I believe. I don't know what effect it's had. I'm just pointing out that when you sent me a belated, you know, in the middle of the night a portion of her victim impact statement that you haven't sent me before, I said this sounds familiar to me. And the familiarity was that I went back to the discussion we had about what happened before the immigration and how she came to have a T visa and she portrayed herself as having been a victim of terrible sexual abuse.

MS. SHIHATA: That wasn't actually her testimony, Judge. But I'm not going to belabor --

THE COURT: Look, the way this came about was because I think in the ordinary course there would be reason to be concerned about a witness who would not normally be getting a T visa. And one of the issues I suppose that one would have been concerned about was whether it had anything to do with her testimony.

60 Proceedings 1 MS. SHIHATA: It did not, Judge. 2 THE COURT: I'm telling you the background of 3 how it came up. And it came up. And you persuaded Mr. Ricco not to press the issue precisely because of -- he's 4 5 the one who was reciting what she said. That was the 6 irony. But you didn't dispute it. I can get the page 7 for you if you want. MS. SHIHATA: That's fine, Judge. One moment, 8 9 your Honor. I'll conclude, your Honor, by just asking 10 the Court given the serious nature of the crime, given 11 the power differential between a lieutenant and a 12 sentenced prisoner, and also given, as the Court in our 13 view correctly determined that the need for deterrence in 14 this case --15 THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you 16 said. 17 MS. SHIHATA: The need for deterrence of others 18 to prevent others from engaging in precisely the same 19 type of conduct which is an issue, and a serious one, 20 that the Court should consider in fashioning a sentence. 21 And with that, your Honor, we would rely on our 22 papers and submit that a sentence of time served, which 23 is essentially what the defense is asking for, is not sufficient to meet the 3553(a) factors. 24 25 THE COURT: What if I don't give a sentence of

```
61
                            Proceedings
1
   time served? What is?
 2
              MS. SHIHATA: Your Honor, in our papers we have
 3
   indicated that we are seeking a sentence of 20 years
   imprisonment. I think that's in line with the sentence
 4
 5
   that Judge Matsumoto gave in the Perez case. On the
 6
   aggravated sexual abuse counts she --
 7
              THE COURT: No, but that case is different.
   That case involved five different inmates who were
 8
 9
   subject to inappropriate --
10
              MS. SHIHATA: Yes, but even on a single count
11
   she gave --
12
              THE COURT: I know, but you can't, even on a
13
   single count, you don't, when you sentence somebody, you
14
   don't look at it that way.
15
              All right. Do you wish to speak? Why don't
   you give me a minute. I have to step out for a minute.
16
17
              MR. RICCO: I do too, Judge, if you don't mind.
18
                          (Off the record)
19
              THE COURT: Okay. Everybody here? Court
20
   reporter ready? Okay. Mr. Martinez, do you wish to
21
   speak?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Judge Korman, I want to thank
23
   you for allowing me to speak to you and address the
24
   Court.
25
              I'd like to start by saying that I'm not
```

Proceedings

perfect. No one is. I've done many good things in my life but I have made a mistake of violating the trust that I earned while working as a lieutenant for a moment of pleasure.

Maria and I had a consensual affair, a secret relationship that we both agreed on, and that's all it was. I did not forcibly rape or forcibly sexually assault Maria. I never forced, demanded, threatened. That is not who I am or how I was raised. She perceived and treated me as someone that she was attracted to and not someone of authority.

THE COURT: You have to speak up. I cannot hear you. That may be my fault. I'm getting old, so -THE DEFENDANT: She perceived me and treated me as someone who she was attracted to and not someone of

16 authority.

Your Honor, this was not worth the torment and anguish I would endure. It cost me everything. The loss of my mother, my career, my pension, my dignity, my honor and now my mental and physical health as I have been in solitary confinement for 59 months. But I'm a man of faith. I have a strong belief in God who believes that in life that good and bad things happen for a reason.

I have overcome adversity growing up. I have traveled to foreign land and witnessed the bombings on

Proceedings

the battlefield proudly protecting our country. The cancer I would fight years later from search, rescue, and recovery at Ground Zero also protecting our country. But this right here by far has been the toughest one because there's no honor here. I have lost focus, let my guard down, and I fell on my sword. This has sent a shock not only to myself but to MDC as well.

I have expressed my regret, since remorse, and my repentance to all this has affected and I express it today to everyone here.

Life is a journey with many unpredictable elements good and bad. Moving forward, I will continue to strive for the good and that is my promise to you, your Honor, for giving me a fair trial, to my children, to my community, and to our country to which I proudly served whenever called, through strength of my character and my commitment to overcome this challenge with dignity, humility, and faith. All of my community, my family and friends and former coworkers have always been supportive and stood by me because they know who I am.

Today, your Honor, I stand alone heartbroken, extremely remorseful, and have learned a lot from this. I take responsibility. I humbly ask for your mercy and compassion not only for myself but for the sake of my ailing grandmother, my children, grandchildren, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

my side.

sentence here?

64 Proceedings family to ask for a second chance to right my wrong. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my lawyers for their hard work and dedication and not abandoning me on the battlefield. To my aunt, there are no words that can express the love and support she has shown me. I've been truly blessed for having her by Your Honor, I thank you for your fairness for allowing me to address everyone here. Thank you. THE COURT: Mark, Mark Gjelaj is the Mark I'm referring to for the record, I don't have to impose separate sentence on each count, do I? I can give one

MR. GJELAJ: You would have to apply it to every one of the counts though, your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: I can't hear you.

MR. GJELAJ: You would have to impose, depending on what your Honor's sentence is, you would have to impose whatever the sentence your Honor is imposing on each and every count to run concurrent depending on what the sentence is. Now some of them have maximum sentences and then you would have to sort of fashion it in that way as well just to ensure that you were within each of those counts, if your Honor understands.

65 Proceedings THE COURT: I think I understand what you're 1 2 saying. Could you come up here for one minute? 3 (Pause in proceedings) THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sentence 4 5 the defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for 6 a period of ten years on each count to run concurrently. 7 And I impose a special assessment, I quess it must be \$1,000, or I can't count? 8 9 THE CLERK: 1,200. 10 THE COURT: \$1,200. And the defendant shall 11 comply with any applicable state or federal sex offender 12 registration requirements. This is a condition that --13 I'm sorry, I should have also said five years supervised 14 release. The defendant shall comply as a special 15 condition of supervised release, the defendant shall 16 comply with any applicable state and/or federal sex 17 offender registration requirements as instructed by the 18 probation office, Bureau of Prisons, or any state 19 offender registration agency in the state where he 20 resides, works, or may be a student. 21 The defendant shall refrain from contacting the 22 victim of the offense unless specific permission is 23 granted by the probation department. This means that he 24 shall not attempt to meet in person, communicate by 25 letter, telephone, email, the internet, or through a

Proceedings

66

third party without the knowledge and permission of the probation department.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The defendant shall participate in a mental health treatment program which may include participation in a treatment program for sexual disorders as approved by the U.S. Probation Department. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of such services rendered or any psychotropic medications prescribed to the degree he's reasonably able financially and shall cooperate in securing any applicable third party payment. defendant shall disclose all financial information and documents to the probation department to assess his ability to pay and his part of the treatment program for sexual disorders. I actually do not think that is required. I don't think he has a sexual disorder. I think that's sufficient. When I say I don't think he has a sexual disorder, as I indicated earlier, he's not going to go out and become a serial rapist. This crime for which he was convicted was a crime that was because he was in a special position that enabled him to do it.

I have taken seriously into account the government's position but it seems to me there are a number of factors here that suggest setting aside the issues that are raised about my own discomfort with the verdict. I accept, as I've often said at sentencing when

Proceedings

people have raised issues about the jury's verdict that I have to accept the verdict whether I agree with it or not, and I'm not sure that I disagree with it. I certainly would not quarrel that the jury could have reached that verdict. But they did acquit him of four of the five most serious offenses.

The considerations that I've taken into account, first, the life that the defendant led, his military service which began at the age of 18 which he served four years in a position which often involved potential risk of life that in the course of while he worked at the MDC he actually helped save someone's life possibly at the risk of his own.

In addition, the defendant worked at the World Trade Center after the tragedy of 9/11. I think he worked for four months. There's of course a high cancer rate of people who worked during the period. He was part of an emergency service unit for a week after the attacks to do search, rescue, and recovery and thereafter he volunteered for approximately four months to help clean up the operation. And you know, he does have cancer. And according to the pre-sentence report and the records received from the Mount Sinai World Trade Center Health confirmed that the defendant is a participant in the World Trade Center medical monitoring and treatment

Proceedings

program. So those are factors that I think deserve to be taken into account.

In addition, he did undergo two trials himself and whatever difficulties that may pose to the victim, it also poses to a defendant which is of course, although there was no double jeopardy violation, the considerations are similar to those that underlie the double jeopardy clause in terms of the effect of multiple trials.

So I take all of those factors into account. I think that the offense is a serious one, as I've said during the colloquy. I am repeating myself I know. The deterrence is not necessary to deter him from doing this again because you won't, but one has to be concerned about deterring people who work at the Metropolitan Correction Center that conduct of this kind will not go unpunished. This was a case involving one individual, whatever the circumstances were, that led to it coming to pass. I think a sentence of ten years for someone who is of his age and who has potential health problems, although his cancer is in remission, is a reasonable and just sentence under the sentencing guidelines.

I'm sorry I kept you here so long.

MS. GEDDES: Your Honor, will you advise the defendant of his right to appeal as well?

```
69
                            Proceedings
              THE COURT: Yes. You have the right to appeal,
1
 2
   Mr. Martinez, and if you can't afford to pay the filing
 3
   fee that we charge, I'll let you file the notice of
   appeal without paying the filing fee and of course Mr.
 4
   Ricco can file the notice of appeal if you wish to
 5
 6
   appeal.
 7
              MR. RICCO: Yes, Judge. I was going to ask on
 8
   behalf of the defendant that you give him in forma
 9
   pauperis relief as he goes forward. Your Honor gave him
10
   in forma pauperis relief at the beginning of the first
11
   trial because he got the transcripts and whatnot. He
12
   has --
13
              THE COURT: I granted that. I thought I said
14
   if he can't -- I mean I thought that sort of encompassed
15
   it when I say if you can't afford to pay the filing fee
16
   I'll let you do it without paying the filing fee.
17
              MR. RICCO: Okay, Judge.
18
              THE COURT: But yes, I grant him leave to
19
   proceed in forma pauperis.
20
              MR. RICCO: Okay. Thank you. The magic words
21
   that the Circuit likes to hear.
22
              THE COURT: Okay. And despite our heated
23
   discussion, I thank the government lawyers for their
24
   help. It's always useful to be challenged.
25
              MS. SHIHATA: And Judge, I apologize if I
```

```
70
                            Proceedings
   overstepped.
1
              THE COURT: No, I don't mind at all. In fact,
 2
 3
   I encourage my law clerks to do it. It helps make for a
   better outcome when you're challenged by bright people.
 4
 5
   Okay. Thank you.
 6
              MR. RICCO: So Judge, normally I would ask that
 7
   the Court make a recommendation that the defendant be
   housed in the metropolitan area. However, because of his
 8
 9
   law enforcement status, his housing is problematic. So I
10
   would just ask to the extent that the Bureau of Prisons
11
   can, given its other concerns, that the defendant be
12
   housed in the metropolitan area as close to it as
13
   possible.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to rely on Mark
15
   Gjelaj to help me formulate this. Where he is now is in
16
   the metropolitan area. I gather you're not enamored of
17
   it.
18
              MR. RICCO: Well, it's a county detention
19
   facility.
20
              THE COURT: I know.
21
              MR. RICCO: Yeah. But he would --
22
              THE COURT: Because they're the Bureau of
23
   Prisons, I assume they'd want to house him at a Bureau of
24
    Prisons facility.
25
              MR. RICCO: Yeah. They don't sentence federal
```

```
71
                            Proceedings
   prisoners in Essex. It's just a detention facility.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Right. I'll recommend -- if you
 3
   want to send me a letter with a recommendation, fine. If
   not, I'll work out something with Mark Gjelaj.
 4
 5
              MR. RICCO: No, that's fine, Judge. Because of
   his law enforcement status, they have a special protocol
 6
 7
   for that.
 8
              THE COURT: Well, I don't know, there are law
 9
    enforcement people in various federal --
10
              MR. RICCO: Yes, Judge.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
12
              MS. SHIHATA: Thank you, your Honor.
13
              MS. GEDDES: Thank you, your Honor.
14
                         (Matter concluded)
15
                                -000-
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, ROSALIE LOMBARDI, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic sound-recording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this ${\color{red} {\bf 19th}}$ day of ${\color{red} {\bf April}}$, 2022.

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.
Rosalie Lombardi
AAERT# CET-656

72